

REMARKS

Claims 2-14 are pending in the application with claims 6, 11, 13, and 14 being the independent claims. Claim 6 is amended. Claims 11-14 are allowed. Claims 2-5, 9 and 10 are objected to as depending from a rejected independent claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,003,928 to Curtindale. Claim 6 is directed to a vehicle body mounting bracket for fixing an auxiliary machinery to a panel in a vehicle body side. It includes a first bracket arranging and supporting said auxiliary machinery to one side. A shaft supporting portion protrudes from said first bracket and fits a fixed shaft supporting said auxiliary machinery to another side. The bracket also includes an engaging portion formed adjacent a peripheral wall portion of said shaft supporting portion. A second bracket holds said first bracket, and an engagement portion is adapted so that the engaging portion is slidably inserted into the engagement portion. It also includes fixing means fixing said first bracket and said second bracket to said panel. The second bracket is arranged in such a manner as to be brought into contact with said panel. The first bracket is arranged in a front side in a mounting direction from said second bracket.

Curtindale discloses an interior trim attachment apparatus for an automotive vehicle including a fastener and a bezel. The bezel (41) includes a main body portion (43) and an annular bearing portion (41). Three box-like dog houses (55) are spaced away from each other and extend back from the surface (49) of the bezel (41). See Curtindale, column 3, lines 9-17.

Curtindale does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it does not teach or suggest all the features of claim 6. Curtindale fails to teach or suggest a

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

vehicle body mounting bracket, including all the recited features of claim 6, with an engaging portion formed adjacent a peripheral wall portion of a shaft supporting portion. Instead, Curtindale teaches a dog house (55) that is not adjacent to any peripheral wall portion of any shaft supporting portion. Because Curtindale does not teach or suggest all the recited features of claim 6, claim 6 is allowable over Curtindale. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 6.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from add additional features to independent claim 6. Additionally, claims 2-5, 9, and 10 depend from add additional features to independent claim 6. These claims are allowable for at least the reason that claim 6 is allowable. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow these claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the timely allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: Jan. 13, 2004

By: 

Dustin T. Johnson
Reg. No. 47,684

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com